



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,301	06/01/2006	Benedicte Isnardon	0518-1101-1	3668
466	7590	09/01/2009	EXAMINER	
YOUNG & THOMPSON			EPSTEIN, BRIAN M	
209 Madison Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Suite 500			3628	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			MAIL DATE	
			09/01/2009	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/581,301	Applicant(s) ISNARDON ET AL.
	Examiner BRIAN EPSTEIN	Art Unit 3628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 01 June 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20060601
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The specification does not include appropriate headings. Examiner respectfully requests applicant to consider the appropriate arrangement of the specification below.

Appropriate correction is required.

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.

- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed June 1, 2006 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered. The cited reference, WO 01/13299 has not been considered because no legible copy of the reference can be found in the application file wrapper.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 1 and 8 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 1 and 8 include abbreviations of claim language within parenthesis. These abbreviations are not necessary and should be removed from the claims which incorporate them. Appropriate correction is required.

5. Claim 9 is objected to because the preamble uses the term, "if" which is suggestive of optional language. That is, if the request for information does not include several dates, the steps required by the claim are not required to be carried out. As a result, claim 9 in its entirety is optional. Applicants are reminded that optional or

conditional elements do not narrow the claims because they can always be omitted.

See e.g. MPEP §2106 II C: "Language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation. [Emphasis in original.]"; and *In re Johnston*, 435 F.3d 1381, 77 USPQ2d 1788, 1790 (Fed. Cir. 2006) ("As a matter of linguistic precision, optional elements do not narrow the claim because they can always be omitted.").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-7 are directed to "system," however the bodies of these claims merely recite "a database," and a "search engine," These elements do not appear to be anything more than program code/software. That is, the claimed "system," does not specifically recite any apparatus which make up the system, instead, it appears applicant is claiming a "system," comprising only software elements. Thus, these "system" claims recite software *per se* (i.e., program code not stored or processed on any physical media). Functional descriptive material such as a computer program must be structurally and functionally interrelated with a medium to allow its intended uses to be realized. Accordingly, claims directed to software *per se* are not patentable subject matter. *In re Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d 1354, 1361, 31 USPQ2d 1754, 1760 (Fed. Cir. 1994). See MPEP § 2106.01 for further guidance and discussion on

computer-related nonstatutory subject matter. Examiner suggests applicant amend the system to include the apparatus elements which include the database/search engine, etc for performing the claimed functionality.

8. Claims 8-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. A claimed process is eligible for patent protection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 if:

"(1) it is tied to a particular machine or apparatus, or (2) it transforms a particular article into a different state or thing. See Benson, 409 U.S. at 70 ('Transformation and reduction of an article 'to a different state or thing' is the clue to the patentability of a process claim that does not include particular machines.');

Diehr, 450 U.S. at 192 (holding that use of mathematical formula in process 'transforming or reducing an article to a different state or thing' constitutes patent-eligible subject matter); see also Flook, 437 U.S. at 589 n.9 ('An argument can be made [that the Supreme] Court has only recognized a process as within the statutory definition when it either was tied to a particular apparatus or operated to change materials to a 'different state or thing' '');

Cochrane v. Deener, 94 U.S. 780, 788 (1876) ('A process is...an act, or a series of acts, performed upon the subject-matter to be transformed and reduced to a different state or thing.')⁷ A claimed process involving a fundamental principle that uses a particular machine or apparatus would not pre-empt uses of the principle that do not also use the specified machine or apparatus in the manner claimed. And a claimed process that transforms a particular article to a specified different state or thing by applying a

fundamental principle would not pre-empt the use of the principle to transform any other article, to transform the same article but in a manner not covered by the claim, or to do anything other than transform the specified article." (*In re Bilski*, 88 USPQ2d 1385, 1391 (Fed. Cir. 2008)).

An example of a method claim that would not qualify as a statutory process would be a claim that recited purely mental steps. Thus, to qualify as a § 101 statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class (the thing or product) to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.

Here, applicant's method steps, fail the first prong of the new Federal Circuit decision since they are not tied to another statutory class and can be performed without the use of a particular apparatus and further, fail the second prong of the new Federal Circuit decision since they do not transform the underlying subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112-2nd Paragraph

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Examiner has attempted to point out several ambiguities below but respectfully requests applicant to consider other potentially indefinite language in the claims. For example, Claim 1 recites the limitation "characterized in

that it comprises" in the sixth line of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Examiner interprets the term *it* the be a/the travel product reservation system. Examiner also points out the "travel product reservation system," appears to go by a plurality of variable names including "said reservation system," in the fifth line of claim 1. Examiner respectfully requests applicant to use consistent naming throughout the claims to make the claims more clear. There is also a lack of antecedent basis for the language, "the input criteria," as there is no "input criteria," previously established in the claim.

11. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 2 recites, "a travel solution search engine communicating with a travel segment database for determining travel solutions that meet the input criteria." However, this is already required by claim 1 since claim 1 requires a "search engine for products that meet input criteria of a user request." Further as to claim 2, there is a lack of antecedent basis for "the travel product search engine MR..." Examiner cannot determine what the "travel product search engine," includes, as there appears to already be a "travel solution search engine," from claim 2 and the "a search engine," from claim 1 which all appear to have the same functionality, that is to search a database for determining travel solutions that meet the input criteria. Examiner points out claim 2 in its entirety is unclear and indefinite. The "travel solution search engine," "travel segment database," and, "travel product search engine," do not include any claim language as to what they are actually required to do besides

communicate between/with each other. Examiner suggests applicant amend the claim(s) to specifically recite what each database includes and what things/steps each database is/are required to perform.

12. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The steps of claim 8 do not particularly point out the method steps required by the claim. That is, the claims recite, for example, "a database," "a request," "the rules," etc. but do not recite a verb/action term defining what step is performed/required by the method. The claims appear to be written in a format representing a system. For the purposes of the prior art rejections below, examiner is interpreting the claims as method steps. Please see below. Similar issues are relevant for claims which depend from claim 8, including, for example, claim 9.

13. Claim 8 recites the limitation "the request input criteria" in the third claim limitation. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

14. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Examiner cannot determine what method step is/are required by claim 12. The claim does not appear to further limit independent claim 8. There is also a lack of antecedent basis for "the database commercial classes of fare families."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

17. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charlton et al. (US 2002/0065688) in view of Daughtrey et al. (US 2004/0078252).

18. As per **claims 1-2 and 8**, Charlton teaches a system and method of processing a request from a user wherein information on selling prices related to travel products is calculated, by accessing a fare database, and is returned to the user, comprising the following operations:

- a. receiving from a user station a request for information relating to travel products for at least one travel date (Abstract; Paragraph 0019; Paragraph 0022; Paragraph 0025);
- b. seeking products meeting the request input criteria and the associated selling prices (Paragraphs 0035-0036; Paragraph 0044);

- c. *sorting the travel products by fare family (Paragraphs 0044-0046; Paragraph 0022; Paragraph 0035), and;*
- d. *returning to the user station a reply containing data relating to the products that meet the input criteria, for display, by sorting them into fare families (Paragraphs 0044-0048) (Charlton teaches returning from a web server lowest fares sorted by fare class including economy/world traveler plus/club etc. that meet the user input of date of departure/return, etc. and requested fare restriction types).*

Charlton does not explicitly teach, *creating a database of fare families containing rules for determining the association with at least one fare family for each travel fare, accessing the rules of determination contained in the fare family database, and; applying the rules of determination to the travel products found to determine their fare family.*

However, Daughtrey teaches a similar system and method and the system and method of Daughtrey indeed includes, *creating a database of fare families containing rules for determining the association with at least one fare family for each travel fare (Paragraphs 0050-0057; Paragraph 0047), accessing the rules of determination contained in the fare family database (Paragraphs 0050-0057; Paragraph 0047), and; applying the rules of determination to the travel products found to determine their fare family (Paragraphs 0050-0057; Paragraph 0047).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have incorporated, *creating a database of fare families containing rules for determining the association with at least one fare family for each travel fare, accessing*

the rules of determination contained in the fare family database, and; *applying* the rules of determination to the travel products found to determine their fare family, in accordance with the teachings of Daughtrey, in order to quickly associate the plurality of different fare types desired by the user with the fares found during the fare database search to quickly present the various lowest cost options by fare type, as suggested by Charlton (see, for example, Paragraph 0044), since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

19. As per **claim 5**, Charlton further teaches, further comprising an interface device connected by a communication network to the user station on the one hand and to the central computer reservation system on the other (Abstract; Paragraph 0019).
20. As per **claim 6**, Charlton further teaches, wherein the communication network is a large scale network (Paragraph 0019) (Charlton teaches the large scale network is the internet).
21. As per **claim 7**, Charlton further teaches, wherein the interface device is a web server interacting with a navigation program residing in the user station to provide a graphic user interface with the user station (Paragraph 0019; Paragraphs 0022-0028).
22. As per **claim 9**, Charlton does not explicitly teach, *when* the request for information includes several dates, *returning to the customer station for display*, information relating to the product that meets the input criteria and has the lowest selling price for each travel date; *selecting* one of the products displayed when the user enters the user station; *addressing* a request for detailed information from the user station,

and; *returning* a reply to the user station for display containing information relating to the selected product and other products that meet the input criteria for the same date by sorting them into fare families.

However, Daughtrey teaches a similar method and the method of Daughtrey indeed includes, *when* the request for information includes several dates, *returning to the customer station for display*, information relating to the product that meets the input criteria and has the lowest selling price for each travel date (Abstract; Paragraphs 0035-0037); *selecting* one of the products displayed when the user enters the user station (Paragraph 0046); *addressing* a request for detailed information from the user station (Paragraphs 0046-0047), and; *returning* a reply to the user station for display containing information relating to the selected product and other products that meet the input criteria for the same date by sorting them into fare families (Paragraph 0047).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have incorporated, *when* the request for information includes several dates, *returning to the customer station for display*, information relating to the product that meets the input criteria and has the lowest selling price for each travel date; *selecting* one of the products displayed when the user enters the user station; *addressing* a request for detailed information from the user station, and; *returning* a reply to the user station for display containing information relating to the selected product and other products that meet the input criteria for the same date by sorting them into fare families, in accordance with the teachings of Daughtrey, in order to create a more usable user interface to allow quicker lowest fare searching for a plurality of fare

types, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

23. As per **claim 10**, Charlton further teaches, wherein for each fare family, only a pre-established number of products that meet the input criteria is displayed, starting with the product having the lowest selling price (Paragraphs 0044-0048; Figure 5) (Charlton teaches displaying one lowest price for each fare family starting with the best overall fare).

24. As per **claim 11**, Charlton further teaches, wherein the input criteria include the origin, the destination, and a non zero number of departure dates (Abstract; Paragraphs 0027-0028).

25. As per **claims 3 and 12**, Charlton does not explicitly teach, the database commercial classes of fare families are created combining at least one group of fare families with a predetermined geographic market for a predetermined number of travel dates.

However, Daughtrey teaches a similar method and the method of Daughtrey indeed includes, the database commercial classes of fare families are created combining at least one group of fare families with a predetermined geographic market for a predetermined number of travel dates (Paragraphs 0036-0037; Paragraph 0042-0045; Paragraph 0060).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have incorporated, the database commercial classes of fare families are created combining at least one group of fare families with a predetermined

geographic market for a predetermined number of travel dates, in accordance with the teachings of Daughtrey, in order to quickly associate the plurality of different fare types desired by the user with the fares found during the fare database search to quickly present the various lowest cost options by fare type, as suggested by Charlton (see, for example, Paragraph 0044), since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results

26. As per **claim 13**, Charlton further teaches, wherein at least one commercial class of fare families is selected (Paragraph 0046; Paragraph 0035) and the users request is only processed for the travel products included in the commercial fare family class or classes selected (Table 3, Page 3; Paragraph 0045; Paragraphs 0051-0052; Paragraph 0036).

27. As per **claim 14**, Charlton further teaches, wherein the selection of the commercial fare family class or classes is made via a user station input (Paragraph 0051; Paragraph 0022; Paragraph 0035).

28. As per **claim 15**, Charlton does not explicitly teach, wherein the selection of the commercial fare family class or classes is made by an administrator. However, Daughtrey teaches a similar method and the method of Daughtrey indeed includes, wherein the selection of the commercial fare family class or classes is made by an administrator (Paragraph 0022; Paragraphs 0041-0045; Paragraph 0036) (Daughtrey teaches selection of commercial fare class made by travel agent). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have

incorporated, wherein the selection of the commercial fare family class or classes is made by an administrator, in accordance with the teachings of Daughtrey, in order to request pricing through a travel agent in order to prevent a busy user from consuming time learning how to search for lowest fares, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

29. As per **claims 4 and 16**, Charlton further teaches, wherein a hierarchical rank is assigned to each fare family in the database for each commercial fare family class, and; at the user station information is displayed relating to the products that meet the input criteria in the order of their hierarchical rank (Paragraph 0046; Figure 5a) (Charlton teaches displaying products of multiple fare classes in order where if "economy flexible" is a selected type, the cheapest flexible economy fare is on top, the cheapest world traveler plus fare is in the middle, and the cheapest club fare is at the bottom of the users graphical user interface).

30. As per **claim 17**, Charlton further teaches, wherein the rules of determining the association with a fare family include, for each fare family a set of attributes a fare must have to be associated with the said fare family (Charlton teaches each fare family attributes can include advanced purchase requirements/minimum stays/cancellation privileges, etc. which define each fare class).

31. As per **claim 18**, Charlton does not explicitly teach, the data in the database of fare families are accessed in real time. However, Daughtrey teaches a similiar method and the method of Daughtrey indeed includes, the data in the database of fare families

are accessed in real time (Paragraphs 0050-0057) (Daughtrey teaches placing teach travel solution into a fare family on the fly). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have incorporated, the data in the database of fare families are accessed in real time, in accordance with the teachings of Daughtrey, in order to provide lowest prices per fare type quickly for the user for user appreciation, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

32. As per **claim 19**, Charlton further teaches, the travel products are air flights that are included in a domestic or international market (Paragraph 0023; Paragraph 0036-0037).

Conclusion

33. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

34. **Examiners Note:** Examiner has attempted to point out various issues with antecedent basis and indefiniteness. However, Examiner respectfully requests applicants to consider other instances of such issues in consideration to this Office Action.

35. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRIAN EPSTEIN whose telephone number is (571)270-5389. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/B. E./
Examiner, Art Unit 3628
August 27, 2009

/JOHN W HAYES/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3628